

Adams, S. A. and Ehorn, S. M. (2016) What is a composite citation? An introduction. In: Adams, S. A. and Ehorn, S. M. (eds.) *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Series: The library of New Testament studies, 1 (525). Bloomsbury T&T Clark: London, pp. 1-16. ISBN 9780567657978

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/111594/>

Deposited on: 28 October 2015

Chapter 1

WHAT IS A COMPOSITE CITATION? AN INTRODUCTION

Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn

One of the many curious features of citations from the Jewish scriptures in the New Testament is that at times an author, although apparently only citing one text, is actually drawing one or more source texts together into a single, composite citation. Although this phenomenon occurs somewhat regularly in the New Testament, there has been very little work focused on this citation technique within the broader Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and early Christian milieux, especially within recent scholarship. The phenomenon, of course, does occur in the broader environment and it is the working hypothesis of this volume that by studying this citation technique in wider compass, one can gain a more incisive understanding of the phenomenon in its own right, but also as it is found in the New Testament.

The studies contained within this volume can only serve as representative examples of composite citations within the period surrounding the New Testament. We have sought to include a diverse range of ancient authors, dating from roughly 350 BCE to 150 CE.¹ This range will allow the studies of this volume to assess potential influences upon the New Testament authors' use of composite citations and the possible literary influences extending from the New Testament. We hope that the examples provided will serve as a helpful step forward in understanding this citation technique by ancient authors.

1. Although outside the scope of this volume, see J. C. C. Döpke, *Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1829), pp. 70–87, who provides a list of composite citations in rabbinic literature. Similarly, the late dating of Book 1 of *Sibylline Oracles* (ca. 150–350 CE?) places the composite citation in *Sib. Or.* 1.57–58 (Gen. 1.28 and 3.19) outside the parameters of this study. See especially J. J. Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', *OTP* 1:331–32.

The following introduction will summarize various issues related to the use of composite citations in antiquity. This begins by providing a working definition of ‘composite citation’ that is intended to provide cohesion to the studies within this volume. This is followed by an extended example of a composite citation that allows for interaction with the working definition. Next, the introduction briefly surveys previous research on composite citations. Following this, we provide a rough overview of this volume in an effort to justify its contents and omissions.

However, before we turn to what this project contains, it is important to identify the study’s parameters. For the majority of the chapters the focus is exclusively on literary works. This is because of space concerns and to provide a more focused project and is not intended to imply that composite citations are only found in literary compositions. This is clearly not the case as composite citations also occur in epigraphic material, especially in magical inscriptions and amulets. For example, three amulets (*IJO* III Syr4, *IJO* III Syr42, and another one from Tel Aviv) all combine Deut. 33.26 and Num. 10.35, with *IJO* III Syr42 also adding Exod. 15.3 and Deut. 6.4.² Similarly, the amulet *IJO* I Ach50 joins a number of passages (Exod. 15.3, 26; 38.8; Num. 14.14) into a combined veneration of God.³ Such examples are intriguing and deserving of investigation, though they fall outside the scope of this project.

Another important subject that will not be covered in these volumes is composite allusion. Although this is related to composite citations and substantially overlaps with our investigation into the creativity of the author, we believe that they require individual attention and investigation in their own right prior to being brought into discussion with citation practice. Moreover, the emphasis (discussed below) on the rhetoric of quotations makes allusions a less useful source of study. This is because allusions must first be identified by the reader/listener before one can speak about their rhetorical effect. As will become apparent below, this project seeks to provide renewed focus on citation practices and definitions and we felt that including composite allusion would distract from that aim.

2. R. Pummer, ‘Samaritan Amulets from the Roman–Byzantine Period and their Wearers’, *RB* 94 (1987), pp. 251–63, nos. 5, 7, 16; D. Noy and H. Bloedhorn (eds.), *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*. Volume 3. *Syria und Cyprus* (TSAJ, 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

3. D. Noy, A. Panayotov, and H. Bloedhorn (eds.), *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*. Volume 1. *Eastern Europe* (TSAJ, 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

Finally, we will also not be discussing so-called Rewritten Scripture or epitomizing texts.⁴ Again, despite having methodological similarities with the creation of composite citations, we thought that the inclusion of these topics would pose too great of a challenge to our specific focus. For example, Rewritten Scripture is an important subfield in Jewish literature and questions of authorial practice and methodology are becoming ever more complex so as potentially to demand their own volume. As a result, works such as *Jubilees*, *LAB*, and Josephus' *Antiquities* will be excluded from discussion unless they contain a composite citation that is marked in some way.⁵

1. Working Definition of Composite Citation

A definition of a composite citation must address both the noun and its adjectival modifier. For the purposes of this volume we will consider a *citation* to consist of the following factors:

- The text must be marked as a citation in some manner, either with: (1) an explicit attribution to an author or speaker; (2) the use of an introductory formula; (3) a noticeable break in syntax between the citation and its new literary context; or, (4) if the citation is well-known in antiquity or cited elsewhere by the same author it can reasonably be considered a citation.⁶
- More allusive examples of literary borrowing, while offering potential information on citation techniques, must only be considered with caution.

4. On the latter, see the interesting studies in M. Horster and C. Reitz (eds.), *Condensing Texts—Condensed Texts* (Palingenesia, 98; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010).

5. Although we had hoped to have a chapter dedicated to Josephus, we were not able to find any composite citation in his corpus. However, a useful discussion of Josephus' stylistic changes to his sources is that by L. H. Feldman, 'Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus', in M. J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2/1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 455–518 (476–81).

6. These criteria draw upon studies by D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT, 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), pp. 11–23, and C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS, 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 33–37.

The *composite* nature of the definition is equally important:

- Within the citation, two or more texts must be fused together.
- This fusing together must not include conjunctions that break between the two fused texts (e.g., *καί, καὶ πάλιν*, etc.). In some instances, the presence of a conjunction within a citation will need to be examined more closely in order to determine if the syntax is broken.
- Prior to or following a list of citations, if the citing author refers to a plurality of sources, the citation should not be considered composite.

These culminate in the following working definition: a text may be considered a composite citation when literary borrowing occurs in a manner that includes two or more passages (from the same or different authors) fused together and conveyed as though they are only one.

We have intentionally avoided defining a composite citation more narrowly for present purposes. For instance, the definition could have addressed, at minimum, the following issues: How many words must be included from either passage in order for a citation to be considered composite? Is the substitution of a single word from the larger literary context sufficient to call a citation composite? How remote must the second (or third, etc.) text be from the first to be sufficiently differentiated? Finally, how do minor confections differ from fuller citations? While such methodological precision would certainly help to refine the studies within this volume, we believe that such parameters would be determined best with hindsight. That is, putative examples of the practice must be examined closely prior to ruling out methodologically other putative examples. Accordingly, we have intentionally left these aspects of the definition open and we hope that the studies in this volume will help to shed light on this definitional issue for future studies on composite citations.

2. An Example of a Composite Citation

It will be useful to provide an example of a composite citation that allows for direct interaction with the working definition supplied above. The example comes from the *Epistle of Barnabas*, a text that was written somewhere between 70 and 132 CE. *Barnabas* has many citations, some of which are the result of the author's own reflection on the Jewish scriptures and some of may have been mediated via the New Testament



and other sources.⁷ Several of *Barnabas*' citations are composite, including the following from *Barn.* 6.6:⁸

τί οὖν λέγει πάλιν ὁ προφήτης;
Περίεσθεν με συναγωγὴ πονηρευομένων (Ps. 21.17 LXX),
ἐκύκλωσάν με ὥσει μέλισσαι κηρίον (Ps. 117.12 LXX),
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον (Ps. 21.19 LXX).

Therefore what again does the prophet say?
A synagogue of evildoers surrounded me,
they swarmed about me like bees around a honeycomb
and for my clothing they cast lots.

Like elsewhere in *Barnabas*, this citation is introduced as something that 'the prophet...says [λέγει...ὁ προφήτης]' (cf. *Barn.* 6.4, 13, etc.), underscoring his view that scripture is prophetic (cf. *Barn.* 6.7). Yet, this singular reference to what the prophet says introduces wording from two psalms. It would appear that *Barnabas* or his source has fused together wording from two different texts.

In their separate editions of the Apostolic Fathers, both Bart Ehrman and Michael Holmes present the final clause of *Barn.* 6.6 as a discrete citation, connected with the conjunction καί:⁹

...ἐκύκλωσάν με ὥσει μέλισσαι κηρίον, καὶ· Ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.

... 'they surrounded me as bees around a honeycomb', and 'for my clothing they cast lots'.¹⁰

7. See esp. M. J. J. Menken, 'Old Testament Quotations in the *Epistle of Barnabas* with Parallels in the New Testament', in J. de Vries and M. Karrer (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity* (SBLSCS, 60; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 295–321; cf. J. Carleton Paget, 'The Use of the New Testament in the *Epistle of Barnabas*', in A. Gregory and C. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 229–49.

8. For a list of *Barnabas*' citations, see R. Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century* (WUNT, 2/82; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), pp. 333–41.

9. However, it is noted that the Latin version of *Barnabas* takes Ps. 21.19 as a separate citation.

10. B. D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume 2* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), ad loc.; cf. M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 3rd edn, 2007), ad loc. Both Ehrman and Holmes appear to be following the editorial decisions of their predecessors.



Although the standard reference editions break the citation at this point, four reasons militate against this division. First, the final clause begins with *καί* in its original context (Ps. 21.19 LXX; cf. Jn 19.24). However, because *καί* is a common connector between multiple citations, this can only serve to raise, and not solve, the question of whether the final clause of *Barn.* 6.6 is part of a composite citation. Second, and more definitively, the previous clause is itself a composite citation, combining texts from Psalms 21 and 117 LXX. The final clause ('and for my clothing...') resumes the line of thought from Psalm 21 LXX. Third, in the opening line of the citation from Ps. 21.17, the wording of the citation is inverted. Specifically, the advancing of the clause *περιέσχεν με* prior to *συναγωγή πονηρευομένων* in *Barn.* 6.6 rhetorically balances the clause with the following composite part: *ἐκύκλωσάν με* (cf. Ps. 117.12). This may suggest a degree of editorial activity in various parts of the citation. Fourth, in a previous composite citation in *Barn.* 5.13, the author presents a composite citation comprised of verses from Psalm 21 and 118 LXX. There, again, the text form is slightly modified from known LXX versions. All these arguments suggest that it is better to view *Barn.* 6.6 as a single, composite citation. It is likely that the texts were fused together because of the *Stichworten* *ἐκύκλωσάν με*, which occur in both Pss. 21.17 and 117.12 LXX.¹¹

Regarding the wording of the citation, the author included *περιέσχεν* (third singular; cf. MSS S G) rather than *περιέσχον* (third plural; cf. Ps. 21.17 LXX), which agrees with the singular *συναγωγή*. The verb from Ps. 21.17 differs in number from most psalm MSS, although it does agree with P. Bodmer XXIV (= MS 2110).

As for the question of who fused these texts, it cannot be ruled out that *Barnabas* received this tradition mediated through another source. The popularity of Psalm 21 LXX in early Christian sources is well-documented, as even a cursory glance at the *Loci citati vel allegati* in a standard New Testament edition shows. Nevertheless, it is important to note that Robert Kraft's study on *Barnabas*'s quotations has shown that there is 'no sign of Christian *Tendenz*. In fact, the quotations are not so much anti-Judaic in flavour as they are pro-ethical.'¹² This provides a key piece of evidence because if *Barnabas*'s citations are generally thought to

11. F. R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief* (KAV, 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), p. 256; *pace* K. Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übertragen und erläutert* (Munich: Kösel, 1984), p. 124, 'Zwei [=Mischzitate] sind unbewußt durch einen Gedächtnisfehler beim freien Zitieren entstanden. Barn 6, 6...'.
12. R. A. Kraft, 'The Epistle of *Barnabas*: Its Quotations and their Sources' (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1961), p. 111.

derive from a collection of texts made for Hellenistic Jewish instruction, the final line of the composite citation in *Barn.* 6.6 is particularly striking.

According to *Barn.* 6.6, *those who belong to a synagogue* ‘cast lots for my clothing’. This usage disagrees with the New Testament gospels, which attribute the fulfillment of Ps. 21.19 LXX to actions undertaken by Romans, not by Jews (cf. Mt. 27.35; Mk 15.24; Lk. 23.34; Jn 19.24). Thus, this composite citation—or at least the final line—is likely an addition by the author of *Barnabas*. In the context of *Barn.* 6.6, the composite citation employs the negative imagery of the righteous person’s enemies from these psalms and applies this to the Jews. In this regard, the citation coheres with the anti-Jewish agenda evident elsewhere in *Barnabas*.¹³

3. Prior Studies on Composite Citations

There are only a few short studies that explore composite citations in any detail.¹⁴ Edwin Hatch’s essay ‘On Composite Quotations from the Septuagint’ appeared in 1889 and considered examples from Clement of Rome, *Barnabas*, and Justin Martyr.¹⁵ Not much later, Franklin Johnson’s essay ‘Composite Quotations’ appeared in his 1895 monograph on *Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*.¹⁶ Unlike Hatch’s study, Johnson presented a wider range of examples, including selections from Cicero, Lucian, Maximus Tyrius, Philo, Plato, Plutarch, and Xenophon. Unfortunately, Johnson’s study did little more than simply catalogue citations that he deemed to be composite. He provided virtually no meaningful discussion of any of his examples and his list is incomplete for several of the authors that he selected. Jindřich Mánek’s 1970 article

13. See esp. W. Horbury, ‘Jewish–Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr’, in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (WUNT, 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 315–46; Hvalvik, *Scripture and Covenant*, pp. 140–41.

14. In addition to those mentioned below, see the section on ‘Verschmelzung und Verkettung zweier oder mehrerer alttestam. Sprüche’, in H. Vollmer, *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus textkritisch und biblischtheologisch gewürdigt nebst einem Anhang über das Verhältnis des Apostels zu Philo* (Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1895), pp. 35–46.

15. E. Hatch, ‘On Composite Quotations from the Septuagint’, in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 203–14.

16. F. Johnson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896).

considered ‘Composite Quotations in the New Testament and their Purpose’. Specifically, Mánek surveyed examples from the New Testament and suggested that composite citations are adduced in order to make proofs in accordance with the rule of Deut. 19.15.¹⁷ Additionally, studies by Dietrich-Alex Koch and Christopher Stanley have each examined composite citations in the Pauline literature in the context of wider discussions of Paul’s citations from the Jewish scriptures.¹⁸

In this survey of previous studies on composite citations, the following areas will be considered briefly: (1) the need of definitional clarity in previous studies; (2) the study of the phenomenon of composite citations as a distinctly Jewish citation technique; (3) the assumption that composite citations are almost always derived from *testimonia* or extract collections; (4) the assumption that composite citations are the result of memory errors; and (5) the function of composite citations. Because Hatch, Johnson, and Mánek provided the most extensive treatments of composite citations, they are primarily referenced. However, several other key works are mentioned when the points under consideration warrant it.

a. Need for Definitional Clarity

Prior studies on composite citations, while limited, have been lacking in terms of definitional clarity. Take, for instance, Johnson’s study, which provided only the following brief statement: ‘New Testament writers sometimes present in the form of a single passage an assemblage of phrases or sentences drawn from different sources’.¹⁹ No attention is paid to the possible difference between condensing/abridging techniques and composite citations and no mention is made about attribution to a single author or source. Equally vague is Hatch’s discussion, which only states that a ‘common feature’ of composite citations is that they ‘are introduced by the same formulae which are used for quotations of single passages’.²⁰ These studies provide very little discussion of the mechanics of citation and, as such, leave various questions unaddressed.

17. J. Mánek, ‘Composite Quotations in the New Testament and their Purpose’, *Communio Viatorum* 13 (1970), pp. 181–88 (186–87).

18. Koch, *Die Schrift*, pp. 172–86; Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, esp. pp. 256, 258–59.

19. Johnson, *Quotations*, p. 92.

20. Hatch, ‘Composite Quotations’, p. 213; cf. D. Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ, 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 22–23, who briefly discusses *amalgamation* as ‘the merging of more than one text without any indication that they come from different portions of Scripture’.

Koch's study distinguished between examples where 'part of a word of scripture has been reshaped using a different scripture' (*Mischzitaten*) and examples where 'two (or more) texts of scripture are merged together, but are not pushed into each other' (*Zitatkombinationen*).²¹ Likewise, Stanley's study, which built upon Koch's work in many ways, distinguished between combined and conflated passages by stating that 'in the former, the individual verses stand on a relatively equal footing and retain a measure of their original independence; in the latter, one verse is clearly dominant and the other subordinate'.²² Both Koch's and Stanley's studies represent definitional improvement on composite citations. However, there is room for further refining of a definition in light of a consideration of more examples from antiquity. See the issues raised in the 'working definition' given above for further information.

b. Are Composite Citations a Uniquely Jewish or Christian Practice?

While both Hatch and Johnson recognized that composite citations occur more widely in antiquity than simply the New Testament, this general observation has been overlooked by many subsequent interpreters. For instance, Mánek's study did not consider any wider uses of composite citations and he argued that such citations emerged because 'the New Testament Christians shared Jewish conceptions'.²³

Interestingly, E. Earle Ellis argued inversely, appealing to a dearth of evidence from Jewish sources:

Combined quotations of two or more texts appear frequently in a variety of forms: a chain of passages (Rom 15,9-12), a commentary pattern (John 12,38-40; Rom 9-11) and composite or merged citations (Rom 3,10-18; 2Cor 6,16-18). *With the exception of the last type these patterns were commonly employed in Judaism.*²⁴

21. Koch, *Die Schrift*, p. 160, 'bei denen ein Teil eines Schriftwortes unter Verwendung einer anderen Schriftstelle umgeformt worden ist'; p. 172, 'zwei (oder mehrere) Schriftworte unmittelbar zusammengefügt, jedoch nicht ineinandergeschoben sind'.

22. Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, pp. 258-59.

23. Mánek, 'Composite Quotations', p. 186.

24. E. E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1978), p. 150 (emphasis added); cf. Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions*, pp. 68 and 160, who adduces only one possible example of textual amalgamation that *may* date earlier than 70 CE (i.e., *Sipre Num.* 42 = Isa. 45.7 + Amos 4.13[?]). Accordingly, this rare technique receives virtually no discussion at all by Instone-Brewer.

Despite Ellis' point that composite or merged citations are not common in Jewish texts, he provides virtually no discussion of the practice in other sources from antiquity, leaving his readers with the tantalizing suggestion that 'for the source of his [i.e., Paul's] frequently used merged quotations one must look elsewhere'.²⁵

It is demonstrably the case that composite citations are found in early Jewish texts. However, as Hatch, Johnson and, several of the studies in this volume show, it is not a uniquely Jewish or Christian practice. Indeed, while not ignoring this early Jewish context, there is also much to be gained by examining composite citations in larger compass within antiquity.

c. Composite Citations as Derived from *Testimonia*/Extract Lists

The presence of shared composite citations in a range of ancient sources has suggested to some that these citations are the result of combinations made from *testimonia* sources or collected extracts. In other words, the physical medium of a list of citations, removed from its/their original context(s), is thought to explain the phenomenon of composite citations. Hatch argued that such a hypothesis best explained the presence of composite citations in the New Testament, especially examples where the same combination of sources occurs in multiple authors (e.g., the pastiche of psalms in Rom. 3.10-18 and Justin, *Dial.* 27.2-3).²⁶ Such examples serve to flag up an important methodological issue: demonstration that two documents are dependent upon a third, shared source *rather than* upon each other.

Additionally, it is possible that sometimes the assignment of a composite citation to another source is adduced as a way of absolving the quoting author. This is sometimes the case within New Testament studies, particularly by those with convictions about the inspiration of its authors. Johnson's study on composite citations presupposes this very issue.²⁷ The relegation of a composite citation to a third party provides a convenient side-step in the event that the fusing of texts is perceived as an error.

25. E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 49–51.

26. Hatch, 'Composite Quotations', pp. 203–4.

27. Johnson, *Quotations*, p. 93, stated that 'censure of a general kind has been passed on all these quotations, simply because they are composite'.

d. Composite Citations as Errors of Memory

Basing his findings upon assumptions of greater textual stability, Emil Kautzsch argued that Paul's 'mixed' or 'composite' citations provide evidence that Paul cited from memory and, further, that such citations became mixed *in his memory*.²⁸ Much has changed in our understanding of the textual situation in the first century CE since the time of Kautzsch. The discovery and eventual publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls has dramatically altered our perception of the fixedness of the biblical text, including Septuagintal texts that appear similar to New Testament citations. Moreover, the papyrological discoveries of the twentieth century have also enhanced our understanding of the textual diversity of the time. Even twenty years after Kautzsch published his study, Hatch concluded very differently: 'the existence of a discrepancy between [a citation] and the existing MSS points not to an inaccuracy on the part of the writer but to a variation in the current text'.²⁹ Significant for present purposes, Hatch dismissed the idea that the New Testament's composite citations are 'misquotations' by appealing to an author's broader citation techniques:

The view that they are mere misquotations in which the several writers have, through defect of memory, blended several passages into one is rendered improbable *by the whole character of the quotations which they make from the Old Testament*.³⁰

Likewise, several recent interpreters have shifted from referring to memory errors as the basis of composite citations and, instead, have emphasized the literary artistry of New Testament authors, finding the notion of adapted or combined citations as the result of memory error to be less than satisfactory in explaining literary links between the revised citation and its new literary context.³¹ Among these writers, Jonathan

28. E. Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo Apostolo Allegatis* (Leipzig: Metzger & Wittig, 1869), p. 10, esp. pp. 80–82, 86–87, 217.

29. Hatch, 'Composite Quotations', p. 204.

30. Hatch, 'Composite Quotations', pp. 203–4 (emphasis added). Followed by J. R. Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–20), p. 1:2.

31. See Mánek, 'Composite Quotations', p. 186; Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, p. 256; cf. *idem*, 'The Social Environment of "Free" Biblical Quotations in the New Testament', in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), pp. 18–27 (26); J. D. H. Norton, *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad* (LNTS, 430; London: T&T Clark International, 2011), pp. 1–38.

Norton has critiqued scholars who sharply distinguish between memory citation and citation via consultation of texts. He argues that rote memorization of texts cannot be so easily differentiated within Paul's oral exegetical environment.³² What is needed is a wider understanding of how memory and textuality both functioned in antiquity to influence citation practice more broadly and composite citations specifically.

e. The Function of Composite Citations

Both Mánek and Johnson have provided explanations concerning the function of composite citations. For example, Johnson wrote that,

An examination of these passages [i.e., texts with composite citations] will show that where the quotation is intended for proof, it is always composed of fragments which originally related to the subject of the argument; and all of them except one or two are brought forward as proofs.³³

According to Johnson, composite citations reflect the creative efforts of an author to bring together texts that focus on a common theme. While Johnson's argument is neither endorsed nor denied here in this introduction, it provides a counter-perspective to the memory error explanation above and it provides a benchmark to consider in other examples of composite citations.

Also emphasizing the logical function, Mánek argued that composite citations were presented in accordance with Deut. 19.15: two or three witnesses are necessary to prove a case. While a provocative suggestion, this explanation is not convincing. Not only can such proofs be made without the use of a composite technique, but the merging of multiple texts into a single citation produces not two or three witnesses *but one*. Stanley's comments on composite citations also emphasize this point: multiple verses are adduced in support of a single proposition. However, the individual verses 'have been melded together into a tightly knit, coherent unit with its own internal logic and carefully balanced rhetorical structure'.³⁴

* * *

32. Norton, *Contours in the Text*, pp. 25–28; cf. W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 31–33; J. P. Small, *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 3–9.

33. Johnson, *Quotations*, p. 92.

34. Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, p. 258.

In light of the preceding discussion, we are left with a set of questions to address in future studies on composite citations: In what ways can a definition of composite citations be refined? What does a wider consideration of composite citations have to offer New Testament scholarship? How do an author's sources contribute to a consideration of composite citations? Is it possible to distinguish unintentional confluences of texts from intentional merging of texts that share common themes and/or terms?³⁵ Finally, how do composite citations function within an author's composition?

4. An Outline of this Volume

The studies in this volume examine composite citations across a range of authors in antiquity. In addition to studies on specific authors or specific corpora, a few of the authors reflect more broadly on issues of education in antiquity and *testimonia* as they relate to composite citations. Additionally, the contributors to this volume will seek to specifically address the following issues:

1. the question of whether the quoting author created the composite text or found it already constructed as such;
2. the question of the rhetorical and/or literary impact of the quotation in its present textual location, as opposed to simply unpacking how the author appears to be interpreting the source text; and,
3. the question of whether the intended audiences would have recognized and 'reverse engineered' the composite citation in question and, as a result, engaged with the original context of each of the component parts.

Each of these questions is complex and enriching. Moreover, these questions are largely ignored by New Testament interpreters when handling passages that contain composite citations. By providing a more extensive account of composite citations in antiquity within the context of these focused issues, this volume hopes to provide a more historically grounded and informed discussion of composite citations.

35. See esp. H. A. G. Houghton, "'Flattening" in Latin Biblical Citations', in *Studia Patristica: Papers Presented at the Fifteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2008* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 271–76, who describes features that are typical of memory citation.

While the following studies do not specifically aim to address any New Testament examples of composite citations, we intend for this volume to serve as something of a methodological base for future studies on composite citations within the New Testament. We hope that this volume will aid such a study by providing a wider perspective that is informed by actual uses of composite citations by other ancient authors. Nevertheless, these studies should not be perceived as merely a means to an end. The contributors are each experts in their respective fields and we hope that the studies in this volume will also be useful and interesting to scholars who have wider interests. A survey of the contents of this volume follows.

The second chapter in this volume, 'Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer', provides a wide-ranging investigation of composite citations in ancient Greek authors. In the first section Sean Adams draws on authors ranging from Plato to Lucian and identifies three ways that composite citations were used by ancient writers: summarizing citations, customized citations for argument, and literary styling. In the latter half of his work Adams explores Homeric school texts and scholia for composite features and argues that the practice of forming composite texts is not limited to literary works, but can be seen in non-literary texts as well.

In a chapter exploring Plutarch's citation practices, Seth Ehorn discusses numerous composite citations from the *Moralia* and the *Lives*. The study begins with a brief consideration of Plutarch's wider compositional techniques and sources, which are determined to be relevant to a study of Plutarch's composite citations. Close textual study shows that Plutarch has likely inherited, mistakenly produced, and intentionally generated composite citations. In each instance a decision must be made based upon various factors. One of the striking features, however, is that Plutarch's composite citations are, in all but one instance, found in his *Moralia*. It is concluded that the circumstances for writing these essays were more conducive to the fusing of texts to improve Plutarch's arguments.

In the fourth chapter Margaret Williams investigates the citation practice of elite Roman letters writers (e.g., Cicero, Seneca the Younger, Pliny). Beginning by situating these writers into their ancient, social context, Williams rightfully highlights the function of letters in elite society and the form that literary citations typically take. Williams shows that explicit citations (let alone composite citations) are rare in these works. There is one exception to this practice (*Ad Fam.* 13.15), a political apologia by Cicero in which he cites a number of authors and

creates a composite citation from Homer's *Odyssey*. Overall, Williams concludes that these elite male authors used literature to underline their shared cultural interests and strengthen the bonds that existed between them.

The fifth chapter is an investigation of Philo's citation technique by James Royse. One of the main focuses of his work is highlighting the fact that a correct understanding of Philo's citations requires an appreciation of the distinction between the presentation of a modern text (with such devices as quotation marks and ellipsis points) and the form of Philo's original writings. Also important for Royse is an understanding of Philo's citation technique and the way that Philo brings texts together. A proper understanding of Philo's handling of texts will allow one to determine what is a genuine composite citation and what is not.

Jonathan Norton is the author of Chapter 6, which looks at the way the author of the Admonition of the Damascus Document constructed composite citations. After evaluating the way that Scripture is excerpted in this section, Norton looks at the thematic uses of Scripture and the unity of the Damascus Document. Following an in-depth discussion of the text's composite citations, the study concludes with Norton reflecting on the exegetical and social contexts of the work; how the work compares to similar works and how the presumed author fits within his ancient Jewish context.

Next, in Chapter 7, Sean Adams and Seth Ehorn evaluate the composite citations in the Septuagint Apocrypha, specifically focusing on four examples (*4 Macc.* 18.18-19; *1 Esd.* 1.55; *2 Macc.* 2.11; and *Bar.* 2.28-35). These works display a diverse range of Scripture use and methods of creating and borrowing citations. This reinforces the understanding that the Apocrypha is a grouping of diverse texts. Nevertheless, there are some similarities that suggest that these authors might have had a similar view of Scripture and how it might be used in support of specific arguments.

In Chapter 8 Garrick Allen examines composite citations in three Jewish pseudepigraphic works: the *Letter of Aristeas*, *Jubilees*, and the Temple Scroll. He argues that the reuse of the Jewish scriptures in these pseudepigraphic works serves to emphasize the perceived unity of scriptural legal judgments in the face of apparent discord. The fusing of like traditions occurred because of both linguistic and thematic similarities. However, the paucity of examples of composite citations (as defined by this volume) leads Allen to conclude that implicit presentations of scriptural reuse are the more usual form of re-presentation.

In Chapter 9 Philippe Bobichon examines Justin Martyr's extant writings and citation practices. Bobichon argues that composite features comprise a majority of the apologist's biblical argumentation. These composite features, including composite citations, are sometimes derived from sources and sometimes are the result of Justin's own textual composition. In the latter case, Justin's deviations from known wording at times amount to textual 'hi-jacking' (particularly in the *Apology*). By contrast, the composite features in Justin's *Dialogue* mirror the composition itself: the merging of multiple scriptural sources into a single, literary feature enhances Justin's composition and underscores his view of the harmony of the Scriptures.

Martin Albl's contribution to this volume focuses on the phenomena of composite citations and the *testimonia* hypothesis. After a survey of the *testimonia* hypothesis, Albl considers two case studies of overlapping composite citations in early Christian literature (e.g., *Barnabas*, Clement, Irenaeus) that largely agree with each other rather than known LXX versions. For this common core of citations, Albl concludes that these authors share a flexible, written source that was probably produced by Christians for apologetic purposes. This flexible source and its new theological context allowed for creative combinations of citations that were, apparently, still considered to be scriptural by the quoting authors.

One notable lacuna is a separate chapter on the composite citations in the Apostolic Fathers, especially focusing on *1 Clement* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*. However, we have selected *Barn.* 6.6 as an example to illustrate our definition of a composite citation earlier in this introduction. Moreover, Martin Albl's chapter on the *testimonia* hypothesis overlaps with this corpus, including examples from *Barnabas*. Therefore, we opted to forego a full chapter on the Apostolic Fathers and to include another significant author from the second century: Justin Martyr. This provides not only a likely *terminus a quem* for all of the New Testament documents, but it also allows for the examination of how Justin takes on Christian traditional material, including his biblical citations.

The studies in this volume are followed by a response from Christopher Stanley. Stanley's essay provides a summary reflection on the previous essays, drawing together the key implications of the studies. Significantly, Stanley also reflects on the import of these studies for New Testament interpreters—that is, the essay is both retrospective and prospective. We hope that the insights identified by Stanley will be useful for a planned second volume on the New Testament's composite citations, which is also scheduled to be published by T&T Clark/Bloomsbury in the LNTS series in the near future.